

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 967

SP 026 462

AUTHOR Hoffman, David E.; Roper, Susan Stavert
TITLE How Valuable Is Teacher Training to Beginning Teachers? An Analysis of Graduate Feedback from a Rural Teacher Training Program.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985). Some tables may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Attitudes; *Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a strategy for evaluating effectiveness of preservice teacher education programs focusing on importance of the program to the beginning teacher. A survey of beginning teachers sought their evaluation of the relative value of selected competencies (N=35) emphasized in their training programs. Responses to a questionnaire were received from 32 elementary teachers, 15 secondary, and 5 with dual positions. The questions sought teachers' opinions on: (1) importance of the listed competencies to teacher success; (2) how skilled they believe themselves to be in each competency at the beginning of their teaching careers; (3) where did they believe they learned each competency; and (4) in relation to other sources of skill, what contribution did their teacher education program make to their teaching competence. Results indicated: (1) Teachers felt almost all of the competencies taught were important to their teaching; (2) While the teachers felt the competencies important to their success as beginning teachers, they did not feel skilled in a number of them; (3) Education coursework emerged as a rival in importance to student teaching; and (4) Education courses and student teaching accounted for about half of the total ratings for valuable sources of competence. Data resulting from the survey are presented in tables. Findings are discussed and implications are drawn in the areas of methodology used in the study, possible areas for assessment of teacher education programs, and insights regarding the design of graduate feedback studies. (JD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED258967

HOW VALUABLE IS TEACHER TRAINING TO BEGINNING TEACHERS?:

An Analysis of Graduate Feedback from a Rural Teacher Training Program

1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.E. Hoffman

David E. Hoffman & Susan Stavert Roper
Southern Oregon State College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

I. Introduction

Graduate follow-up used to be a relatively informal process at Southern Oregon State College in Ashland, Oregon. The only teacher training program within 180 miles in any direction, Southern Oregon State's mission was a regional one with most of its graduates employed within the Southern Oregon region. As a consequence, in years past, faculty could visit graduates during their first year of teaching to observe them in their classrooms and to conduct interviews with the graduates and their administrators. Data generated by this informal process was primarily of anecdotal nature ranging from the accounts of problems encountered in the new teaching position to the perceptions of graduates and their administrative superiors regarding the quality and appropriateness of the college's pre-service program. The mission of the college has not changed, but partly due to fewer teaching openings in the area, and partly because of severe budget cuts at the college, this method of obtaining feedback from graduates has become too costly.

The Education faculty decided that a self-administered survey of graduate feedback would have to take the place of the individual visitation procedure. Our new survey began with a list of the teaching competencies which functioned as the primary objectives of our pre-service program. The list of thirty-five (35) competencies had been assembled over previous years from faculty reviews of research literature, from interviews with our graduates and from the counsel of experienced teachers within the region. The survey requested graduates to rate the importance of each competency to their success during the first year of teaching. Following this question, the graduates were asked to indicate their perceptions of their skill level at each competency at the beginning of their first year of teaching. A third question had the

SP 026462

graduates identify the major source of competence. That is, where or from what experience did they believe they had gained the most skill relative to each particular competency. Through the responses to these questions, we are assessing the relevance of our program's competencies to the instructional practice of our graduates, the degree of skill which our graduates attribute to themselves, and the impact of the various elements of our pre-service program on perceived competence.

Our purpose in this paper, however, is not to provide a detailed descriptive case study of the Southern Oregon pre-service program. Rather, we wish to share our strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher education programs that focuses on the question: How valuable is pre-service teacher education to the beginning teacher? Data from our own institution is primarily meant to be illustrative of what we believe to be an innovative and informative graduate follow-up strategy.

II. Alternative Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Education Programs

Traditional attempts to measure the impact of pre-service programs usually follow one of two patterns: observations of graduates or reports of graduates' perceptions. We present some advantages and limitations of these two approaches and some variations of each to explain our choice and to encourage readers to select an approach that is most suitable to their institution.

In the first approach beginning teachers are observed to determine if their classroom performance demonstrates the behaviors implicit in program goals or objectives. If, for example, a stated objective of a program is to develop questioning skills, trained observers visit the classrooms of recent graduates seeking evidence of questioning behavior. A more recent version of the observation-based approach appears to have been spawned by teacher effectiveness research. Here, the sought-after behaviors are those validated by teacher effectiveness research rather than those goals peculiar to a specific pre-service program.

Though a favored approach in empirical research on instruction, the observational approach is not without some drawbacks as a follow-up procedure. We have already pointed out the cost of operating such a program. Trained and paid observers are beyond the finances of many institutions, including our own. Transportation costs are

significant. Besides the skill of the observers, the reliability and validity of the procedure is dependent upon such things as adequate observations (one is not enough) and student and teacher response to being observed.

The second pattern typically used in the evaluation of teacher education programs is that of relying upon the perceptions of program graduates obtained through interviews or self-administered questionnaires. When surveying the perceptions of beginning teachers, it is common practice to have them rate the degree to which program goals were accomplished. The implicit assumption of this approach is that students obtained the skills associated with program objectives solely through the formal pre-service teacher education program. Today, that assumption is being widely questioned. The many alternative routes to certification that have been proposed (some, which eliminate teacher education courses as a requirement) suggest that skills needed to become a teacher do not have to be learned in a teacher education program. (Boyer, 1984) Thus, our faculty wanted an instrument that would not only give us some information regarding the strengths and weakness of our program, but also would provide us with some notion about the impact that various elements outside the program had on beginning teachers' instructional competency.

Another common approach to evaluation, using the perceptions of graduates as the source, is needs assessment. While not exactly a direct evaluation technique of an on-going program, the needs assessment model has been employed essentially for that purpose in many institutions, including our own. (Pigge, 1983; DeVoss, 1980) Graduates identify problems which they encounter in their teaching positions. Inferring from these problems, evaluators then generate assumptions about the effectiveness of the program as well as new objectives or competencies to be incorporated into it. Needs assessment is a very popular approach to identifying program goals in a variety of educational settings. We have, however, found the system to be less than satisfactory for the reasons which follow.

Among the problems that we encountered using needs assessment approaches to determining program ends, or teaching competencies, is that when administered during the tenure of the first or second year of teaching, graduates' responses often cover many of the broad issues and problems confronting the profession rather than address the issue of the appropriateness of our programs' standing competencies. Additionally, the limitation of questionnaires which ask for a listing of only the

problems encountered by beginning teachers is that any skill area that is not identified as a problem is by implication suspect as being irrelevant to a sound program. The natural consequence of such an approach to program goal-setting, design, and evaluation is that it leads to a perennial and often agonizing reappraisal of goals followed by a sometimes deadening exercise in the reinvention of programs from the ground up-- in form, if not in substance. The result of our open-ended needs assessment efforts has been mountains of needs and problems from which we spend hours generating new lists of competencies and goals. Without alteration, needs assessment plans that we have utilized do not provide a mechanism for reducing the heap of perceived problems to manageable terms.

Rejecting needs assessment and rating program goals for the reasons stated above, we still became convinced that a survey of our graduates perceptions was the best approach for our program. Unlike observation, it was also financially feasible-- a not insignificant consideration.

Relying on the perceptions of teachers to evaluate pre-service training is, admittedly, a subjective approach. As such it is vulnerable to criticism of bias inherent in subjective judgement. However, in the absence of agreement about the teacher behavior that represents more competent teaching, other approaches are also subjective. They rely on the subjectivity of the researcher, the outside observer or program faculty, who must select what each believes to be appropriate teaching skills and the methods of their measurement. Our approach trades the subjectivity of these people for the subjectivity of the teacher; the person most familiar with the complexities of the world of the classroom. Despite problems of distortion, incomplete memory and a temptation to blame insufficient training for classroom inadequacies, the perceptions of beginning teachers provide a rich a valid resource of information. We believe that there are several advantages to the teacher oriented approach to evaluation.

First, teachers are the most informed source about the problems they confront in the classroom and their competence in dealing with them. Second, teachers' own individual experience provides a unique base of information about when and where they gained the competence they need in the classroom. That is, the experience and perceptions of teachers have their own special validity. Third, teachers are the only genuine bridge between the training program and the classroom. They alone have been

in both settings and can recognize the usefulness of the program, and can compare it with skills gained from other academic sources, life experiences and personal invention. A fourth advantage of relying upon beginning teacher perceptions as a means to evaluate pre-service training is that it allows evaluation of diverse programs with a multitude of objectives. Teacher reports become the common base for assessing the effectiveness of training in providing skills teachers need on the job.

III. Major Questions of the Study

We designed our graduate follow-up instrument to seek answers to four questions:

1. How important do our beginning teachers believe each of our programs competencies is to teaching success?
2. How skilled do they believe themselves to be in each competency at the beginning of their teaching careers?
3. Where do our graduates believe they learned each competency?
4. In relation to other sources of skill, what contribution does our teacher education program make to beginning teachers' teaching competence?

IV. Procedure

A. Sample

The data reported in this paper was gathered in the spring of 1983 and 1984. The follow-up questionnaire which we used in this study was mailed to graduates of our Basic Certificate Program for the academic years of 1981-82 and 1982-83. (In Oregon, this is the basic 4-year undergraduate program in both elementary and secondary education) Both secondary and elementary graduates were contacted. We contacted only those persons whom we knew to be employed as teachers; a total of approximately 150. From this cohort, we received responses from 52 teachers: 32 elementary, 15 secondary and 5 with dual positions (return rate of approximately 32 percent). While elementary teachers outnumbered secondary teachers in the sample, the proportions closely represent the comparative numbers of elementary and secondary graduates hired in those years. Twelve respondents had gone through the Basic program as graduate students. Of the remaining graduates, three had been in our program only as seniors; nine as

juniors and seniors; nine began as sophomores and 19 began at our institution as freshmen. These proportions are relatively close to the distributions of students in our teacher education program.

Our questionnaire did not attempt to gather specific demographic data on the location, school size or type of community in which the graduates served as teachers. However, a check of the addresses to which the questionnaires were sent suggests that our graduates enter teaching positions located in rural, small to medium sized towns, and suburban communities rather than large city or inner-city locations. The demography of rural and small town Oregon is such that one can reasonably surmise that classrooms are predominantly Anglo, and from working to middle class backgrounds. If such communities contain residents that could be classified as culturally or racially different, they would likely be American Indian or Hispanic. Even so, the proportion of minority school-age populations in most small Oregon communities served by our graduates would normally be less than five percent.

B. Design of Questionnaire

The questionnaire which was prepared in this study listed the 35 primary objectives of our Basic Certificate program, which are also considered to be the program's basic "teaching competencies". We shall refer to these items as "competencies" throughout the remainder of this report. For each competency, the questionnaire requested graduates to respond to three statements:

1. Indicate the degree to which you feel this competency is IMPORTANT to your teaching success this year.
2. Indicate the extent to which you feel that you were skilled in this competency at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching.
3. Indicate the one or two sources (or types of experience) that contributed the most to your competence at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching.

In responding to the first question, the graduate was expected to indicate degree of importance on a four-point scale: 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = important, 4 = very important. A four-point scale was also utilized on the second question, dealing with level of skill at the beginning of the first year of teaching: 1 = not skilled, 2 = somewhat skilled, 3 = skilled, 4 = very skilled.

Our reasoning for asking for a self-evaluation of skill level at the beginning of the school year came from past experience. On similar questionnaires and questions we had noticed that when we asked our graduates to evaluate their skill at performing at our program's competencies, they tended to evaluate their skill at the time they filled out the questionnaire-- in our case, after eight months of full time teaching experience. Both our experience with beginning teachers and our knowledge of research on beginning teachers strongly argued that a considerable amount of on-the-job learning takes place within the first months of a teaching career. (Hess and Roper, 1972)

Answering the question on "sources of competence", the graduate could list one of the eight sources as the most contributing to his/her level of skill at a given competency. These sources are shown in Figure 1

(Figure 1 here)

If the graduate indicated that he/she had been "somewhat skilled", "skilled" or "very skilled" in a particular competency at the beginning of the first year of teaching, one of the eight sources of competence was to be identified as the major source of that skill. Respondents were also allowed to write in sources other than those listed. Examination of the returned forms indicated that few respondents chose to list other sources. Review of the written responses to this alternative revealed that only four graduates listed pre-service experiences that could not be reasonably categorized under one of the eight stated sources of competence. This provided some assurance that our list was relatively inclusive.

Prepared in the form of an eight page questionnaire (see attached Appendix 1 for copy), the evaluation instrument was mailed to the graduates in April of the two years of the study. Follow-up letters were sent to remind those graduates who did not respond within two weeks following the initial mailing.

C. Data Collection and Analysis

In reference to the questions on importance of the program's teaching competencies, frequency distributions of responses and mean scores on the four-point

Figure 1

Sources of Teaching Competence

Pre-Teacher Education Experiences

1. Academic undergraduate or graduates courses outside of Education (Example: courses in your major field, if secondary, or in general studies).
2. Experience working with youth (summer camp, Boy/Girl Scouts, religious schools, playground director, etc.)
3. Recollection of the methods and styles of teaching used by teachers that you had in public schools

Teacher Education -- Pre-Service

4. Academic coursework in Education courses (lectures, seminar, methods courses, Education foundations courses, microteaching)
5. Practicum experiences that are part of the teacher education program but are outside of student teaching (tutoring, teacher assisting,)
6. Student teaching

Personal Sources

7. Personal invention: skill was developed through personal study, invention or experience gained prior to the beginning of the first full year of teaching

Other

8. Personal one-to-one counseling and advisement by individual college staff persons, outside of formal classes or field experience

evaluation scale were compiled for each of the 35 competencies. The same compilations were made of respondents' ratings of their perceived skill level for each teaching competency. The descriptive results of the study are shown in Table 1.

(Table 1 here)

Table 1 provides a comparative representation of the data dealing with the importance of each of the 35 program competencies. The reader's attention is directed to Column 1 of the table. Using as a basis for arrangement, the mean score of importance of each, the competencies are arranged in descending order, beginning with "Teacher oral communication skill".

Owing to the ordinal nature of the data generated on the four-point scale, mean scores of competency importance were not the major statistic of interest. The graduates' responses on this item were treated as a two value variable: scores of 1 ("no importance") and 2 ("somewhat important") were treated as a single score; in this case, a low evaluation. Scores of 3 ("important") and 4 ("very important") were likewise combined into a single value representing high importance. Presented in Columns 2 and 3, the comparative ratings of graduates for each competency are shown as the percentage of respondents who rated the competency of no or little importance as opposed to those who rated them as high importance.

The same treatments were used on the questionnaire responses which dealt with level of skill at beginning of the first full year of teaching. Column 4 gives the mean skill level score for all those rating themselves on the particular competencies, while Columns 5 and 6 provide the percentage of those who rated themselves low and high on each competency, respectively.

Combining the information from the importance rating and the skill level rating, we developed a new statistic which we called the "competency gap". The competency gap is a figure representing the difference between the percentage of respondents listing a given competency as important or very important (Column 3) and the percentage of those rating themselves as high skilled (Column 6) (see Table 1). Of particular interest were those competencies which our graduates listed as important yet considered themselves as less than skilled in performing. This gave us some idea of the specific areas in which in our graduates believe they need the most help. We will

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF QUESTIONS REQUESTING BOSB PROGRAM GRADUATES' IDENTIFICATION OF THE IMPORTANCE AND PERCEIVED LEVEL OF SKILL FOR EACH OF THIRTY-FIVE (35) TEACHING COMPETENCIES

TEACHING COMPETENCIES	Col. 1 MEAN IMPORT- ANCE OF COMPE- TENCY	Col. 2 PERCENT- AGE OF NO OR LITTLE IMPORT- ANCE 1	Col. 3 PERCENT- AGE OF HIGH IMPORT- ANCE 2	Col. 4 MEAN BEGIN- NING LEVEL OF SKILL	Col. 5 PERCENT- AGE OF NO OR LITTLE SKILL 3	Col. 6 PERCENT- AGE OF HIGH SKILL 4
1. Teacher oral communi- cation skill	3.98	0	100	3.39	8	92
2. Ability to establish pos- itive class climate	3.88	0	100	2.88	27	73
3. Ability to keep students on task	3.84	0	100	2.54	35	45
4. Ability to match methods and materials to abilities/needs	3.84	0	100	2.37	65	35
5. Ability to assess needs and performance	3.82	0	100	2.46	56	44
6. Ability to deal with personal stress	3.82	4	96	2.42	52	48
7. Ability to work with students of different acad. ability	3.82	0	100	2.49	53	47
8. Ability to motivate student interest	3.80	0	100	2.68	46	54
9. Ability to communicate with parents	3.78	2	98	2.86	32	68
10. Knowledge of subject matter	3.78	0	100	2.98	29	71
11. Ability to adjust methods to response of students	3.74	2	98	2.82	36	64
12. Teacher reading skill	3.70	10	90	3.68	8	100
13. Ability to organize a variety of teaching materials	3.64	2	98	2.82	34	66
14. Teacher spelling skill	3.64	8	92	3.37	12	88
15. Ability to adjust teach- ing to criticism	3.62	2	98	2.98	22	78
16. Teacher writing skill	3.62	6	94	3.42	2	98
17. Ability to sequence learning activities	3.60	4	96	2.84	32	68

TABLE 1 (continued)

TEACHING COMPETENCIES	MEAN IMPORT- ANCE OF COMPE- TENCY	PERCENT- AGE OF NO OR LITTLE IMPORT- ANCE	PERCENT- AGE OF HIGH IMPORT- ANCE	MEAN BEGIN- NING LEVEL OF SKILL	PERCENT- AGE OF NO OR LITTLE SKILL	PERCENT- AGE OF HIGH SKILL
18. Ability to work with admin- istrators and supervisors	3.54	6	94	2.98	28	72
19. Ability to move smoothly from activity to activity	3.52	8	92	2.64	48	52
20. Ability to relate subject to student needs/val/expert.	3.49	8	92	2.68	45	55
21. Ability to individualize methods	3.49	6	94	2.38	64	36
22. Ability to use effective closure at end of lessons	3.47	12	88	2.25	67	33
23. Ability to manage number of on-going activities at once	3.44	4	96	2.29	58	42
24. Teacher math skill	3.43	18	82	3.00	22	78
25. Ability to work with fellow teachers	3.42	12	88	3.12	20	80
26. Ability to provide students with personal goals	3.41	6	94	2.29	63	37
27. Ability to match materials with goals	3.39	12	88	2.72	42	58
28. Ability to match math/mat to affective abilities/needs	3.35	14	86	2.50	56	44
29. Ability to individualize content	3.35	10	90	2.28	74	26
30. Ability to work with students of different race/class/ethnic	3.34	10	90	2.64	44	56
31. Ability to work with students of multicultural backgrounds	3.27	17	83	2.54	48	52
32. Ability to work with handicapped	3.21	17	83	2.17	71	29
33. Ability to handle routine admin/instructional detail	3.16	20	80	2.50	44	56
34. Ability to state measure- able learning outcomes	3.09	18	82	2.47	57	43
35. Ability to match math/materials to psych-motor abilities/needs	2.96	24	76	2.24	67	33

1 Figure represents the percentage of graduates who scored the item (1) or (2) on "importance of this competency to your teaching success."

2 Figure represents the percentage of graduates who scored the item (3) or (4) on "importance of this competency to your teaching success."

3 Figure represents the percentage of graduates who scored the item (1) or (2) on "level of skill at beginning of your first full year of teaching."

4 Figure represents the percentage of graduates who scored the item (3) or (4) on "level of skill at beginning of your first full year of teaching."

return to the issue of the competency gap in the "Results" section of this report.

Sources of competence data was analyzed in two ways. First, an aggregate picture was obtained by totaling the number of times each of the eight sources of competence was listed (Figure 3). While this provided some general information regarding relative importance of each source, we wanted to know which sources of competence provided skill for different competencies. For example, did student teaching help only on "Ability to adjust methods to responses of students", or on "Knowledge of subject matter" as well? To obtain this information we categorized the thirty-five competencies into five categories, including a "Miscellaneous" one (see Table 2).

V. Results and Discussion

The first two questions to which this study was devoted can be answered with a fairly direct reading of the data provided in Table 1.

1. How important do our beginning teachers believe each of our program's competencies is to teaching success?

The ratings of graduates on the importance of the competencies indicates a rather consistently high score across the 35 items. It appears our first year teachers feel that all or most of our competencies are important to their teaching. This gives us some assurance that our program's competencies are, indeed, on track.

Beginning with the competency of "Teacher's oral communication skills", the first five, and highest rated, competencies have mean ratings of from 3.90 to 3.82, where the highest possible score would have been 4.0 (Column 1 of Table 1). The percentage of high importance figure (Column 3) provides support for the location of these competencies at the top of the ranking. For each of the highest ranked competencies, 100 percent of the respondents chose a rating score of 3 ("important") or 4 ("very important"). No more than nine of the program's 35 competencies had less than 90 percent of the respondents rating the competencies less than "important". The lowest scored item, "Ability to match methods and materials to the psycho-motor abilities and needs of students", produced a mean of 2.96, with 76 percent of the graduates rating the item either important or very important.

2. How skilled do our graduates believe themselves to be in each competency at the beginning of their teaching careers?

While our graduates perceived almost all of the competencies as important to their success as beginning teachers, they did not feel skilled on a number of them. The fact that the range of reported skill level was much greater (high = 100, low = 26 on Table 1 Column 6) than that of the importance rating is certainly consistent with our knowledge of beginning teachers. Starting a new job, especially one as complex as teaching, can be overwhelming. Everything seems important and one is keenly aware of one's own inadequacies. It would be interesting to administer our instrument to teachers at various stages in their career to determine if some things become less important and if perceived skill level increases.

Of more interest than the singular responses on importance or skill level is the information we generate by looking at them both simultaneously. With the exception of "teacher reading and writing skills" (#12 and #16), graduates rated themselves lower on skill level than they did on the importance of the competency. As stated previously, we refer to this difference as a "competency gap". The relative sizes of the competency gap can be appreciated by observing Figure 2.


(Figure 2 here)

For comparative purposes, we selected eight of the program's competencies which represent the extremes in the size of the competency gap. In the case of "Teacher reading skill" and "Teacher writing skill", the gap is a positive one of +10 and +4, respectively. That is, for reading skill, 90 percent of the respondents on the item rated it of high to very high importance, while all (100 percent) rated their skill level at this basic literacy competency as high to very high. Given the media "hype" and publicity in national reports regarding inadequate "basic skills" of teachers today, it is interesting that these beginning teachers see their own reading, writing, and, even math skills, as the least problematic issue of their success as teachers.

At the other extreme, on "Ability to match methods and materials to student abilities and needs" 100 percent of the respondents rated the competency high to very high importance, while only 35 percent felt that they possessed a high or very high level of skill at this competency, leaving a competency gap of -65. The remaining competencies represented on the graph include those five with the largest negative competency gaps. Of those competencies with the largest competency gaps, five of the

FIGURE 2

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RATINGS OF "HIGH" TO "VERY HIGH" ON IMPORTANCE OF COMPETENCY AND RATINGS OF "SKILLED" TO "VERY SKILLED" ON LEVEL OF SKILL FOR REPRESENTATIVE COMPETENCIES ("COMPETENCY GAP")



the six relate directly to individualizing and personalizing instruction. A complete list of the "competency gaps" is found in Table 2.

(Table 2 here)

Table 2 presents data on the competency gap for each of the thirty-five competencies. It is categorized into nine general areas, including a catch-all "miscellaneous" category. The most striking observation from this data is that the mean competency gaps for seven of the nine categories (excluding Knowledge of Subject Matter and Literacy, and, Staff Relations) are quite similar. Arranging competencies into categories masks the variation between competencies. Once again, if we include Knowledge of Subject Matter and Literacy, and, Staff Relations, the variation between the competencies within the remaining categories is almost as great as that of the total list of competencies. Our analysis, therefore, will focus on specific competencies rather than upon general categories.

3. Where do our graduates believe they learned each competency?

Figure 3 shows the total number of times each source was cited as the primary origin of skill, for all respondents, for all 35 competencies. The most striking finding is that education coursework, one of the most maligned aspects of teacher preparation, emerges as a rival to student teaching. These two sources share top ratings among our beginning teachers as the primary sources of teaching skill. Before we celebrate this finding, however, we must consider that these results may be a function of the low response rate to the questionnaire. Students willing to take the time to fill out a lengthy follow-up questionnaire may be positively disposed to our program, thus skewing the results in favor of our education courses.

(Figure 3 here)

Of the eight potential sources of competence, four are clearly selected most frequently. They are:

1. Academic courses outside Education (16 percent of the total)
2. Education coursework (23.8 percent of the total)
3. Student teaching (25 percent of the total)
4. Personal invention (18 percent of the total)

TABLE 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE MEAN PERCENTAGE OF THOSE REPORTING HIGH IMPORTANCE AND THE MEAN PERCENTAGE OF THOSE REPORTING HIGH SKILL FOR EACH CATEGORY OF TEACHING COMPETENCIES

	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LISTING COMPETENCY OF HIGH IMPORTANCE	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LISTING THEMSELVES OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCENTAGE OF HIGH IMPORTANCE AND PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY ("COMPETENCY GAP")
CATEGORY 1: KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER AND LITERACY			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
1. Teacher reading skill	90	100	+10
2. Teacher writing skill	94	98	+4
3. Teacher spelling skill	92	88	-4
4. Teacher math skill	82	78	-4
5. Teacher oral communication skill	100	92	-8
6. Knowledge of subject matter	100	71	-29
Mean Percentage within category	93	87	-6 Competency Gap
CATEGORY 2: ADAPTING TO NEEDS OF STUDENTS			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
7. Ability to work with students of multicultural backgrounds	83	52	-31
8. Ability to work with students of different race/class/ethnic	90	56	-34
9. Ability to relate subject to student needs/values/experiences	92	55	-37
10. Ability to match math/math to affective abilities/needs	86	44	-42
11. Ability to match math/math to psycho-motor abilities/needs	76	33	-43
12. Ability to work with students of different academic ability	100	47	-53
13. Ability to work with handicapped students	83	29	-54
14. Ability to provide students with personal goals	94	37	-57
15. Ability to individualize methods	94	36	-58
16. Ability to individualize content	90	26	-64
17. Ability to match methods and materials to abilities/needs	100	35	-65
Mean Percentage within category	89.8	48.9	-40.9 Competency Gap

TABLE 2: Part 2 Continued


	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LIST- ING COMPETENCY OF HIGH IMPORTANCE	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LIST- THEMSELVES OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCENTAGE OF OF HIGH IMPORTANCE AND PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY ("COMPETENCY GAP")
CATEGORY: DELIVERY			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
18. Ability to adjust methods to responses of students	98	64	-34
19. Ability to move smoothly from activity to activity	92	52	-40
20. Ability to use effective closure at end of lessons	88	33	-55
Mean Percentage within Category	92.7	49.7	-43 Competency Gap
CATEGORY: MOTIVATION AND ON TASK BEHAVIOR			
TEACHING COMPETENCY			
21. Ability to establish positive class climate	100	73	-27
22. Ability to motivate student interest	100	54	-46
23. Ability to keep students on task	100	45	-55
Mean percentage within category	100	57.33	-42.7 Competency Gap
CATEGORY: PLANNING			
TEACHING COMPETENCY			
24. Ability to sequence learning activities	96	68	-28
25. Ability to organize a variety of teaching materials	98	66	-32
26. Ability to match materials with goals	88	58	-46
Mean Percentage within Category	94	64	-30
CATEGORY: ADMINISTRATIVE			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
27. Ability to handle routine admin/instructional detail	88	56	-32
28. Ability to manage a number of on-going activities at once	96	42	-54
Mean Percentage within Category	88	49	-39 Competency Gap

TABLE 2: Part 3 Continued

	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LIST- ING COMPETENCY OF HIGH IMPORTANCE	PERCENTAGE OF GRADUATES LIST- THEMSELVES OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCENTAGE OF OF HIGH IMPORTANCE AND PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SKILL ON THE COMPETENCY ("COMPETENCY GAP")
CATEGORY: ASSESSMENT			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
29. Ability to state measure- able learning outcomes	82	43	-39
30. Ability to assess needs and performance	100	44	-56
Mean Percentage within Category	91	43.5	-47.5
CATEGORY: STAFF RELATIONS			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
31. Ability to work with fellow teachers	88	88	-8
32. Ability to work with admin- istrators and supervisors	94	72	-22
Mean Percentage within Category	91	76	-15
CATEGORY: MISCELLANEOUS			
TEACHING COMPETENCIES			
33. Ability to adjust teaching to criticism	98	78	-20
34. Ability to communicate with parents	98	68	-30
35. Ability to deal with job-related stress	96	48	-48
Mean Percentage of all thirty-five Teaching Competencies	92.5	57.74	-34.8

FIGURE 3

TOTAL NUMBER OF TIMES EACH OF THE EIGHT SOURCES OF TEACHING COMPETENCE WAS IDENTIFIED AS THE PRIMARY SOURCE FOR ALL THIRTY-FIVE COMPETENCIES



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Three of these sources lie within the formal educational program of the institution while the fourth, "personal invention", lies without. Of the remaining four sources, only "experience working with youth in non-college settings" appeared to offer some instructional experience for our graduates (2.4 percent of the total). The sources of "recollection of methods of past teachers" and "one-to-one counseling by professors outside formal elements of the program" were seldom credited as principal sources of teaching skill.

The "practicum" source is peculiar to our college's program. It is a pre-student teaching field experience in which candidates spend time observing and working as a teacher aide in the opening week of the public school. If a larger response rate supports this finding, we must rethink the wisdom of keeping this part of our program intact. The important point to be made is that our instrument has demonstrated an ability to locate an element of a program that would appear to have little to recommend it in its present form-- at least in the minds of our graduates. The ability of the instrument to investigate the contribution of other sources can be illustrated further, as we address the fourth question of the study.

4. In relation to other sources of skill, what contribution does our teacher education program make to beginning teachers' teaching competence?

In looking at the aggregate data presented in Figure 2, teacher educators could take heart. Two program elements, education courses and student teaching, account for about half of the total ratings for sources of competence. While this is informative, it is more useful to program revision to know in which specific teaching areas do the various sources provide competence. Table 3 provides this information from reports of skill sources for each specific teaching competency. In constructing the table, we used the same categories in grouping competencies as we used in construction of Table 2.

(Table 3 here)

Our graduates did indeed discriminate between sources when considering individual competencies. Additionally, graduate ratings conformed to the understanding our faculty had when we assembled our program's 35 competencies. While the competencies we chose were believed to be essential to classroom and professional performance, we did not assume that all were the products of our formal teacher education program. As

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF QUESTIONS REQUESTING SOBC PROGRAM GRADUATES' IDENTIFICATION OF SOURCES OF COMPETENCE RELATING TO EACH OF THIRTY-FIVE (35) TEACHING COMPETENCIES; NUMBER OF GRADUATES IDENTIFYING PARTICULAR SOURCES UNDER EACH COMPETENCY

SOURCES OF COMPETENCE	ACADEMIC COURSES	NONCOLLEGE EXPERIENCE	RECALL OF PAST TEACHERS	EDUCATION COURSES	PRACTICUM	STUDENT TEACHING	ADVICE OF PROF	PERSONAL INVENTION
CATEGORY: KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT WRITER AND LITERACY								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
1. Teacher reading skill	25	-	3	2	-	1	1	12
2. Teacher writing skill	27	-	2	2	-	1	1	11
3. Teacher spelling skill	26	-	3	2	-	-	1	14
4. Teacher math skill	30	-	2	4	-	-	1	8
5. Teacher oral communication skill	26	-	2	-	-	2	2	12
6. Knowledge of subject matter	29	3	-	8	-	4	1	3
Totals for Category	163	3	12	10	-	8	7	60
Percentage of Total	60	1.7	4.4	6.5	-	2.9	2.6	22
CATEGORY: ADAPTING TO NEEDS OF STUDENTS								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
7. Ability to work with students of multicultural backgrounds	1	10	3	9	2	6	-	6
8. Ability to work with students of different race/class/ethnic	1	14	2	11	3	3	-	8
9. Ability to relate subject to student needs/val/exper.	4	7	1	12	1	17	-	8
10. Ability to match meth/mat to affective abilities/needs	4	10	1	17	-	6	1	6
11. Ability to match meth/material to psycho-motor abilities/need	5	1	-	19	2	10	2	2
12. Ability to work with students of different acad. ability	3	7	-	9	3	18	-	4
13. Ability to work with handicapped	2	3	-	20	3	3	2	4
14. Ability to provide students with personal goals	2	4	2	15	1	12	-	8
15. Ability to individualize methods	4	7	1	13	3	15	-	5
16. Ability to individualize content	4	1	2	20	3	13	-	5
17. Ability to match methods and materials to abilities/needs	6	2	-	21	2	13	-	6
Totals for Category	36	66	12	166	23	116	5	62
Percentage of Total	7.6	13.6	2.5	34	4.7	23.9	1	12.8

TABLE 3: Part 2 (Continued)

SOURCES OF COMPETENCE	ACADEMIC COURSES	NONCOLLEGE EXPERIENCE	RECALL OF PAST TEACHERS	EDUCATION COURSES	PRACTICUM	STUDENT TEACHING	ADVICE OF PROF	PERSONAL INVENTION
CATEGORY: <u>DELIVERY</u>								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
18. Ability to adjust methods to response of students	3	4	-	9	1	21	-	9
19. Ability to move smoothly from activity to activity	3	4	-	10	1	20	-	9
20. Ability to use effective closure at end of lessons	5	2	-	11	3	18	1	5
Totals for Category	11	10	-	30	5	59	1	23
Percentage of Total	7.9	7.2	-	21.6	3.6	42.4	0.7	16.5
CATEGORY: <u>MOTIVATION AND ON TASK BEHAVIOR</u>								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
21. Ability to establish positive class climate	4	7	3	8	3	12	-	12
22. Ability to motivate student interest	7	4	3	10	3	12	-	9
23. Ability to keep students on task	3	9	1	3	3	25	-	4
Totals for Category	14	20	7	21	9	49	-	25
Percentage of Total	9.6	13.8	4.8	14.5	6.2	33.8	-	17.2
CATEGORY: <u>PLANNING</u>								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
24. Ability to sequence learning activities	6	4	1	21	3	9	-	4
25. Ability to organize a variety of teaching materials	6	3	2	16	4	11	-	6
26. Ability to match materials with goals	4	3	1	23	3	9	-	8
Totals for Category	16	10	4	60	10	29	-	18
Percentage of Total	10.9	6.8	2.7	40.8	6.8	19.7	-	12.2
CATEGORY: <u>ADMINISTRATIVE</u>								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
27. Ability to handle routine admin/instructional detail	1	3	1	4	-	25	1	8
28. Ability to manage number of on-going activities at once	1	8	-	1	-	26	1	5
Totals for Category	2	11	1	5	-	51	2	13
Percentage of Total	2.4	12.9	1.2	3.9	-	60	2.3	15.3

TABLE 3: Part 3 (Continued)

SOURCES OF COMPETENCE	ACADEMIC COURSES	NONCOLLEGE EXPERIENCE	RECALL OF PAST TEACHERS	EDUCATION COURSES	PRACTICUM	STUDENT TEACHING	ADVICE OF PROF	PERSONAL INVENTION
CATEGORY: ASSESSMENT								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
29. Ability to state measurable learning outcomes	3	-	1	35	2	6	-	1
30. Ability to assess needs and performance	2	3	1	26	3	12	1	1
Totals for Category	5	3	2	62	5	18	1	2
Percentage of Total	3.1	3.1	2	63.3	5.1	18.4	1	2
CATEGORY: STAFF RELATIONS								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
31. Ability to work with fellow teachers	3	4	-	1	1	14	2	18
32. Ability to work with administrators and supervisors	-	4	-	-	1	15	3	17
Totals for Category	3	8	-	1	2	29	5	35
Percentage of Total	3.6	9.6	-	1.2	2.4	34.9	6	42.2
CATEGORY: MISCELLANEOUS								
TEACHING COMPETENCIES								
33. Ability to adjust teaching to criticism	2	3	1	9	1	16	2	11
34. Ability to communicate with parents	-	7	-	1	1	14	2	13
35. Ability to deal with job-related stress	2	5	-	3	-	7	3	21
Totals for Category	4	15	1	13	2	37	7	45
Percentage of Total	3.2	12.1	0.8	10.5	1.6	29.8	5.6	36.3

12

TOTAL FOR EACH SOURCE	252	148	39	376	56	396	28	283
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	16	9.4	2.4	23.8	3.5	25.1	1.8	18

stated previously, we determined that of the eight sources of competence chosen for study, three (education courses, practicum experience and student teaching) were considered to be located within the formal education program. For some of the competencies, we expected that graduates would cite sources within the education program more likely than outside sources. As an example, student teaching is chosen by 42 percent of the respondents who identified sources of skill for the three competencies under Delivery, while less than 3 percent recognize it as the primary source of skill under Knowledge of Subject Matter and Literacy. In this latter category 60 percent of the respondents chose academic courses as the major source of knowledge, not education courses or student teaching; a finding that would be expected if one follows the logic that knowledge of subject matter literacy skills are most likely learned in courses primarily devoted to those purposes.

Personal invention figures presented us with some support for assumptions that we held about our program prior to this study. The figures also presented some surprises and more than a modest amount of indecision about how personal invention's contribution to graduates' teaching competency should be interpreted. The totals on the third page of Table 2 indicate that this item was the third highest ranked source of teaching competency (18 percent of the total).

In the competency of ability to deal with job-related stress, we were not surprised to find 51 percent of the respondents crediting personal invention, while a total of 24 percent chose education courses, practicum and student teaching as the primary sources of skill. For the past several years our faculty has struggled with the belief that stress is a persistent problem for beginning teachers. Yet, to date, we have developed no specific course offerings or field experiences to address the issue. Thus, the graduate is left to rely upon his or her own inventiveness for adjustment and solution.

Within the category of Staff Relations, we were somewhat surprised that personal invention was given a comparatively high rating (42.2 percent) as a source of skill in the area of ability to work with fellow teachers, administrators and supervisors, owing to the fact that interpersonal communication skills have been a part of our formal education course curriculum for several years prior to this study. In the staff relations category, education courses were listed as primary source by only 1.2 percent of the respondents.

What is to be made of these data? We are far from sure. Assuming that a larger response rate supports our findings, are we to conclude that our program is weak in any category or competency where personal invention is given significant credit, compared to teacher education sources? Or should we credit our program for having selected resourceful and inventive people? Probably neither interpretation is as appropriate as the recognition that the unpredictability and complexity of the teaching task will always mean that the unique, personal abilities teachers bring to their work are bound to be significant. Should we rejoice in the finding that teaching demands many things of its practitioners, not the least of which is human invention? Should we allow ourselves to hope that in some regard our program both encourages and cultivates invention and creativity?

As a postscript to our discussion of the results concerning sources of teaching competency, we refrain from suggesting that our data proves that our education program is more effective in preparing teachers than is our academic undergraduate and graduate liberal arts and science program. The ratings given teacher education sources exceed that given to academic courses, but the ratings given to any of the sources is dependent upon the number and character of the particular teaching competencies we have chosen to examine. One could raise the rating given any source simply by increasing the list of competencies which are closely related to what is likely to be learned from that source.

VI. IMPLICATIONS

This study has implications in three areas: methodology, possible areas for assessment of our teacher education program, and insights regarding design of graduate feedback studies. In the first area, we wish to emphasize our awareness that our response rate is too low to place complete confidence in the accuracy of our analyses. We have allowed ourselves the luxury of speculating about what the data might be telling us, but we know that we must substantially increase our response rate before we can place great store in the results. To improve response rate, we plan to shorten the instrument, make follow-up telephone calls to non-respondents, and elicit the support of our graduates in contacting their colleagues to encourage them to respond.

As far as an assessment of our teacher education program, we will present some areas of interest that we will be examining with a larger sample of our graduates over the next few years. Given this caveat, we do think that the data provides some interesting patterns that may or may not be substantiated by a larger response rate.

Our analysis of the data has led us to conclude that all of the program's competencies are viewed as important by our graduates. What the competency gap concept indicates is the areas in which our graduates need the most help. The larger the gap, the more help is assumed to be needed. In view of the fact that our follow-up instrument is meant to be a means of evaluating our program's effectiveness, it is more precise to view the competency gap as indicating which teaching competencies need to be strengthened within the existing pre-service program. Further, if we combine our findings dealing with sources of teaching competence to these, we gain some confidence as to where, within our program, we ought to concentrate our efforts.

To illustrate the above point, we have noted that our graduates rate themselves low in skill in "Ability to match methods and materials to abilities and needs of students" (a competency gap of -65). Consulting Table 3, #17, we find that 21 of the respondents who felt that they possessed a modest to high level of skill on this competency credited education courses as the primary source of their skill, while 13 recognized student teaching. Taken together, 68 percent of the respondents chose either education courses or student teaching as the primary sources of their ability for this competency. This finding suggests that teacher education sources are significant to this particular competency. The finding does not suggest, however, that our teacher education program is successful in fostering this competency --far from it! What we believe it does suggest is, that to raise skill level in this area, program modification efforts might well be focused upon changes in both education courses and student teaching.

A similar conclusion might not be warranted by the examination of "Ability to assess needs and performance", located under Assessment in Table 2. The competency gap for #30, "Ability to assess needs and performance", is relatively high (-56), indicating that assessing student needs and performance may deserve to be a focus of our program modification work in the future. Consulting Table 3 for the same

competency, we find that more than twice as many graduates (26 or 53 percent) chose education courses, opposed to student teaching (12 or 24 percent), as the source of their perceived skill. These findings suggest that formal education courses, as they relate to teaching our students assessment procedures, are the appropriate place to focus our change efforts.

Before progressing into further analysis of our findings, it must be acknowledged that one important insight is not available through our analysis: It is one thing to identify which competencies graduates feel themselves poorly and highly qualified in performing. It is something else to establish a precise cut-off score that identifies those competencies which need to be strengthened in our program from those where graduates likely possess adequate skill level. Does a competency gap of -65 indicate real and demonstrable inability to perform in the classroom? Is a score of -31 just as convincing? It is likely that all teachers feel themselves less than skilled in a variety of important instructional skill areas at the outset of their careers. Some of these feelings are no doubt confirmed by performance; others are primarily the manufacture of the emotional insecurities which accompany being a new teacher. How great must the difference between perceived importance and perceived skill level for a particular competency be, to command our attention? At this point in our instrument's design, using ordinal data, we are not sure. Given this limitation, we nonetheless find some interesting patterns in the competency gap data which we feel suggest both the need for and the location of program change.

Figure 2 presents the six competencies with the largest negative competency gaps. Among these competencies are the abilities to keep students on task, assess needs, individualize methods and content and personalize goals. We account for the competency gaps in these skill areas by relying on our own informal assessment of the instructional skills needed by the practicing teachers with whom we work. By our estimate, the six competencies are among the most demanding and difficult instructional skills to master. We were surprised by the uniformity of size of these competency gaps, but not by the fact that many of our graduates found themselves limited in their ability to perform well in these areas. Experienced master teachers, who serve in an advisory capacity to our faculty, have brought these needs to our attention for a number of years.

This study has helped us identify several areas which we want to examine more closely with more respondents. More important, however, we have found that our instrument works. That is, beginning teachers were able to identify sources for their skills on some fairly general teaching competencies. Using this approach, teacher educators can begin to gain some understanding of the particular components of their programs that are perceived as useful to the beginning teacher and those which are not. They can compare the success of these components to other sources of competence outside of their program, thus achieving some insight into the types of skills teacher training can and cannot provide. We hope that this approach will be useful to researchers who wish to explore the impact of experience on perceived competence and sources of competence. Hopefully, such research, together with graduate feedback studies, will add to the knowledge of teacher needs. Such knowledge is essential to developing good pre-service and inservice programs.

VII. CONCLUSION

Our questionnaire elicited answers to three interrelated questions: 1. According to our graduates, what are the important competencies for success as a beginning teacher?; 2. How skilled do they believe themselves to be as beginning teachers?; 3. Where do they think they obtained their skills?

We found that our graduates generally perceive the formal competencies that our faculty has chosen for our program to be of significant importance. We found that these graduates generally do not perceive themselves to be as highly skilled in instructional and individualization competencies as they do in basic literacy and interpersonal skills. We concluded that the difference between perceived importance and perceived level of skill, at each competency, is a significant item of interest. We determined it to be a suitable mechanism for identifying elements of our program in need of improvement. Our findings dealing with sources of competence deserve more elaboration.

Comparing teacher training as one, but only one, potential source of competence is a new approach to graduate feedback. Unlike more common assessments where graduates simply rate or comment on various components of the teacher training program, our

questionnaire was structured to obtain information identifying those skills the program transmits and those that are learned elsewhere. Thus, the teacher education program cannot get either all the credit or all the blame for the skill level of graduates. By examining the frequency with which teacher education is listed as a source of competency with other potential sources, one learns something about the relative impact of each.

In regard to the findings concerning our program, we were impressed by the comparative strength of the teacher education component of our program; i.e.: education courses and student teaching. Assuming support for the findings from a larger sample, there are more important conclusions. As a result of our design, we can choose more precisely the target of our change efforts. We can direct our attention to changing the curricula of our formal education courses, strengthen student teaching, or rely on personal invention-- depending on the evidence at hand concerning the relative effect that each source has on the particular competency that happens to be under consideration.

Another conclusion which we draw from our study concerns the relative influence that personal invention has on becoming an effective teacher. We did not design our study to determine whether pre-service training is clearly the primary source of what most experienced teachers come to know about teaching. Although our study was confined to only pre-service experiences, the contribution of personal invention to teaching skill, suggests support for the common wisdom of on-the-job experiences as the single most contributing source of competence.

We tend to agree with Phillip Jackson's observation about the "unpredictability", "complexity" and "immediacy" of classroom tasks. Jackson argues that because of these characteristics much of the teacher's competence is based on intuition rather than knowledge.

"Given the complexities of his work, the teacher must learn to tolerate a high degree of uncertainty and ambiguity. He must be content with doing not what he knows is right, but what he thinks or feels is the most appropriate action in a particular situation. In short, he must play it by ear."
(Jackson, p. 167)

If Jackson is correct, our graduates' perceptions about personal invention are not condemnations of our program but natural consequences of the nature of teaching and learning in the classroom. We have no reason to believe that teacher education makes

no impact on the skill with which our graduates' teach. We do however, make allowances for the extension of teaching skill through experience.

Results from a larger response rate over the next few years will make the new follow-up questionnaire a useful tool for establishing priorities in our efforts to improve our program. It will also give us base-line data against which to evaluate future change. A realistic goal for a pre-service program would unlikely be to reduce these competency gaps to zero. Instead, it would be to shorten the gap while keeping in mind that beyond the impact of pre-service training, on-the-job experience contributes highly to the ultimate skill level of teachers.

We close this report by reminding the reader that our purpose was not to gain information about possible new missions for our basic certification program. We do not argue for a widening of pre-service training. We hold to the notion that it may be better to do a few things well than many superficially. We are attempting to find out the value that our graduates place on the skills we consciously try to teach them. We are attempting, also, to find out how well we are accomplishing our objectives and which elements of our program are the most salient in this quest. Once we possess a more accurate understanding of these issues, we can begin to think more realistically about what can be learned and what constitutes the best environment for our students to become competent teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- James Boyer. High School: A Report on Secondary Schools in America. New York: Harper-Row, 1983.
- Gary DeVoss & Donald Hawk. Follow-up of 1973-79 Graduates of the Ohio State University's College of Teacher Certification Program. Technical Report #5, The Ohio State University; Columbus, Ohio, 1980.
- J. D. Greenberg. "The Case for Teacher Education: Open and Shut." Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (4), 2-5, 1983
- Robert Hess & Susan Roper. Evaluative Assessment of Exemplary Pre-Service Teacher Training for Inner City Elementary Teachers, Vol. VII, 1972; Contemporary Research, Inc., 1100 Glendon Ave., Los Angeles, CA. 90024
- Philip Jackson. Life in the Classrooms. New Jersey; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, p. 167.
- Fred Pigge. Follow-up Evaluation Studies and Procedures. College of Education, Bowling Green State University; Bowling Green, Ohio, 1984 (ERIC Ed 240-083)

GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

GENERAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS

The first series of questions require you to give general descriptive information about yourself and your work at Southern Oregon State College. Please respond to each item by: 1) circling the number of the answer or, 2) by filling in the blank that corresponds to you.

1. When did you finish your education for your Basic teaching credential?

- | | |
|---------|------------------|
| 1. 1983 | 5. 1979 |
| 2. 1982 | 6. 1978 |
| 3. 1981 | 7. 1977 |
| 4. 1980 | 8. Prior to 1976 |

2. Which years did you attend Southern Oregon State College?

1. As a graduate, working on a Basic Credential
2. As a senior, only
3. As a Junior and senior
4. As a sophomore, junior and senior
5. As a freshman, sophomore, junior and senior

3. In what area do you hold a Basic Credential?

1. Elementary
2. Secondary
3. Both

4. Indicate any Special Endorsement area that you may hold from Southern Oregon State College.

1. Reading
2. Media
3. Handicapped Learning
4. Early Childhood Education
5. Math
6. Supervision

5. If you hold a Secondary Basic Credential, what subject area(s) are you endorsed to teach? Please write in your response.

6. What, if any, extra-duty assignments do you carry in your current assignment? Include both paid and non-paid assignments. Please write in your response.

7. What is your current teaching assignment? (A junior high assignment should be listed as secondary; a middle school assignment in which you are assigned a sixth grade class as the major part of your load should be listed as elementary. If you hold more than one assignment, check each job held).

1. Regular Classroom Teacher: Elementary
2. Reading Specialist: Elementary
3. Media Specialist: Elementary
4. Handicapped Learner Specialist: Elementary
5. Early Childhood Specialist
6. Math Specialist: Elementary
7. Regular Classroom Teacher: Secondary
8. Reading Specialist: Secondary
9. Media Specialist: Secondary
10. Handicapped Learner Specialist: Secondary
11. Math Specialist: Secondary

8. At the end of the current academic year (June), how many years of teaching experience will you have completed since receiving your Basic Credential? (Do not count student teaching or substitute teaching. For fractions of years, round off to nearest whole number)

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. One (1) year | 5. Five (5) years |
| 2. Two (2) years | 6. Six (6) years |
| 3. Three (3) years | 7. Seven (7) or more years |
| 4. Four (4) years | |

The next three questions ask you to rate the components of your Teacher Education program at Southern Oregon State College using the following scale: 1 = Inadequate, 2 = Barely Adequate, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good

9. Generally, how would you rate the required professional education courses as preparing you for your first teaching position, after finishing the program --(includes all Education courses, plus field experience)? Circle the number of your choice of responses.

1. Inadequate
2. Barely Adequate
3. Good
4. Very Good

10. Generally, how would you rate the General Studies program in preparing you for your first teaching position?

1. Inadequate
2. Barely Adequate
3. Good
4. Very Good

- 11.*** For Secondary Teachers Only*** Generally, how do you rate the preparation that you received in your endorsement or major subject area, at Southern Oregon State College, as preparing you for your first year of teaching?

1. Inadequate
2. Barely Adequate
3. Good
4. Very Good

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION OF TEACHING COMPETENCIES

In order for the Education Department, at SOSO, to effectively evaluate the college's current Teacher Education Program, we need to know what graduates feel were important and unimportant elements of the program, relative to their teaching careers.

The following list of items contains a number of teaching competencies which beginning and experienced teachers believe are essential to successful teaching.

We want to know your opinions about the importance of these teaching competencies; how well you feel that you were prepared in these competencies by the beginning of your teaching career; and what elements, if any, of your college education do you believe were sources of skill in these teaching competencies.

It is unlikely that beginning teachers feel as skilled in some of these competencies as do teachers with several years of experience. It is also unlikely that all teachers agree as to the level of importance of each competency that is necessary for success in teaching.

In this section, we ask you to respond to three questions:

First, you are asked to determine the IMPORTANCE of each competency to your teaching success;

Second, how skilled do you feel you were in each competency at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching (your first full-time paid position after completing teacher training);

Third, WHERE you believe you obtained the level of skill that you identify under each competency.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Column 1

In Column Number 1, indicate the degree to which you feel this competency is IMPORTANT to your teaching success this year, even though this may not be your first year of teaching.

- 1 = not important
- 2 = somewhat important
- 3 = important
- 4 = very important

2. Column 2

In Column Number 2, indicate the extent to which you feel that you were skilled in this competency at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching.

- 1 = not skilled
- 2 = somewhat skilled
- 3 = skilled
- 4 = very skilled

3. Column 3

In Column Number 3, indicate the one or two sources (or types of experience) that contributed the most to your competence at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching.

Refer to the separate list of "SOURCES OF COMPETENCE KEY", on blue paper, which is folded within this questionnaire, and use the letter key to identify the source from which you gained skill in each competency.

If you indicated in Column 2 that you are "not skilled" in a competency, leave Column 3 blank for that competency.

If you indicated in Column 2 that you had some degree of skill in dealing with the competency (a score of 2, 3, or 4), complete Column 3 for that competency. Indicate the letter that represents the major source of competence. If another source contributed significantly, list the second source under the first letter (see the example below).

[EXAMPLE]

In the example below, the teacher states that knowledge of subject matter is "very important" (4) to teaching success (see answer in Column 1). In Column 2, the teacher scores him/herself as "somewhat skilled" (2) at the beginning of his/her first year of teaching. In Column 3, the teacher determines that the major source(s) of skill in subject matter was from "academic undergraduate or graduate courses outside of Education" (A). In addition, the teacher feels that a second significant source of skill in the area of knowledge of subject matter came from his/her experience in "academic coursework in Education courses" (see the letter 'D' under the 'A' in Column 3).

	COLUMN 1 Importance ... to teaching success	COLUMN 2 Level of skill at beginning of career	COLUMN 3 Sources of Competence Refer to blue KEY sheet
1. A knowledge of subject matter taught in courses which you teach	4	2	A D

GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION ITEMS

TEACHING COMPETENCIES

	COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3
	Importance of this competency to your teaching success	Level of skill at BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching	Sources of Competence (A - H) Refer to the "Sources of Teaching Competence Key"
	1 = not important 2 = somewhat important 3 = important 4 = very important	1 = not skilled 2 = somewhat skilled 3 = skilled 4 = very skilled	Indicate the letter on the KEY which represents the major source of competence at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching. List a second source <u>under</u> the first choice, if you feel that it is significant.
1. A knowledge of subject matter taught in courses which you teach			
2. Ability to clearly state learning outcomes in measurable terms			
3. Ability to assess student performance and needs prior to and after instruction			
4. Ability to identify methods and materials that are appropriate to the learning needs and abilities of students.			
5. Ability to identify methods and materials that are appropriate to the psychomotor needs and abilities of students			
6. Ability to identify methods and materials that are appropriate to the affective (attitudes and values) needs and abilities of students			
7. Ability to organize a variety of teaching materials that can be employed in the classroom			
8. Ability to match materials to the goals of lessons			
9. Ability to place learning activities in appropriate sequence for instruction			
10. Ability to introduce lessons in such a way as to motivate student interest			
11. Ability to provide for individual differences in <u>content</u> used in teaching			
12. Ability to provide for individual differences in <u>methods</u> used in teaching			
13. Ability to adjust teaching methods, while teaching, to responses of students			
14. Ability to move from one learning activity to another smoothly, without losing student attention			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHING COMPETENCIES

	COLUMN 1 Importance of this competency to your teaching success 1 = not important 2 = somewhat important 3 = important 4 = very important	COLUMN 2 Level of skill at BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching 1 = not skilled 2 = somewhat skilled 3 = skilled 4 = very skilled	COLUMN 3 Sources of Competence (A - H) Refer to the "Sources of Teaching Competence Key" Indicate the letter on the KEY which represents the major source of competence at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching. List a second source <u>under</u> the first choice, if you feel that it is significant.
15. Ability to end lessons in such a way as to insure students' retention of information			
16. Ability to handle routine classroom administrative and instructional tasks without interrupting student learning			
17. Ability to manage a number of on-going activities or groups of students at the same time			
18. Ability to keep students on task during classroom activities and study time			
19. Ability to establish a positive classroom climate for learning			
20. Ability to work effectively with students of different cultural backgrounds			
21. Ability to work effectively with students of different social class, racial or ethnic background			
22. Ability to work effectively with students of different intellectual and academic ability			
23. Ability to provide opportunities for students to develop personal goals			
24. Ability to relate subject matter and activities to personal needs, values and experience of students			
25. Your own skill in reading			
26. Your own skill in spelling			
27. Your own skill in writing			
28. Your own skill in math			
29. Your own skill in oral communication (word usage and grammar)			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHING COMPETENCIES

	COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3
	Importance of this competency to your teaching success 1 = not important 2 = somewhat important 3 = important 4 = very important	Level of skill at BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching 1 = not skilled 2 = somewhat skilled 3 = skilled 4 = very skilled	Sources of Competence (A - H) Refer to the "Sources of Teaching Competence Key" Indicate the letter on the KEY which represents the major source of competence at the BEGINNING of your FIRST FULL YEAR of teaching. List a second source <u>under</u> the first choice, if you feel that it is significant.
30. Ability to work with fellow teachers in a productive manner			
31. Ability to work with administrators and supervisors in a productive manner			
32. Ability to deal with and control the stress you may experience in your teaching position			
33. Ability to mainstream handicapped students in your classroom			
34. Ability to adjust teaching strategies in response to constructive criticism			
35. Ability to communicate effectively with parents			

SOURCES OF TEACHING COMPETENCE KEY

USE IN SCORING COLUMN THREE (3)

Sources of Competence at Beginning of First Full Year of Teaching

PRE-TEACHER EDUCATION EXPERIENCES:

<u>Key</u>	<u>Experience</u>
<u>A</u>	Academic undergraduate or graduate courses outside of Education (Example: courses in your major field, if secondary, or in General Studies)
<u>B</u>	Experience working with youth (summer camp, Boy/Girl Scouts, Sunday School, playground director, ESCAPE Program, etc.)
<u>C</u>	Recollection of the methods and styles of teaching used by teachers that you had in public schools

TEACHER EDUCATION---PRE-SERVICE:

<u>D</u>	Academic coursework in Education courses (lectures, seminars, methods courses, Education foundations courses, microteaching)
<u>E</u>	Practicum experiences that are part of the Teacher Education Program but are outside of student teaching (Example: tutoring, teacher assisting, September Experience)
<u>F</u>	Student Teaching (includes Reading Practicum, block student teaching and full-day for elementary, and half and full-day student teaching for secondary)
<u>G</u>	Personal one-to-one counseling and advisement by individual college staff persons, outside of formal classes or field experience

PERSONAL SOURCES:

<u>H</u>	Personal invention: skill was developed through personal study, invention or experience gained prior to the beginning of the first full year of teaching
----------	--

OTHER SOURCES OF COMPETENCE OF INDIVIDUAL NATURE:

If, prior to full time teaching, you had gained competence in a particular teaching skill from a source other than those listed above, write out the source in the space provided on the answer sheet in Column Three (3), instead of using the above letter key.